

REMARKS

Claims 1-61, 64-69, and 73-84 are pending in this Application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 17-19, 30, 39-40, 49, 61, 64, 68-69, 77, and 79 have been amended. No new matter is added. Reconsideration in view of the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

I. Formal Matters

The Office Action objects to claim 79 because it depends from a canceled claim. Claim 79 is amended to depend from pending claim 69 to obviate the objection. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the objection to the claims.

II. Claims Define Patentable Subject Matter

The Office Action rejects claims 61, 64-66, 69, 73-76, 78, and 84 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Anvekar (U.S. Patent No. 6,603,968) in view of Ala-Luukko (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0050047) and further in view of Joss (U.S. Patent No. 6,684,073); rejects claim 67 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Anvekar in view of Ala-Luukko in view of Joss and further in view of Berg (U.S. Patent No. 6,876,860); rejects claim 68 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Anvekar in view of Ala-Luukko in view of Niepel (U.S. Patent No. 6,671,523) and further in view of Joss; rejects claims 1-7, 10-22, 25-35, 38-46, 49-54, 56-57, 60, 77, and 80-83 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Anvekar in view of Molne in view of Ala-Luukko and further in view of Joss; and rejects claims 8-9, 23-24, 36-37, 47-48, 55, and 58-59 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Anvekar in view of Molne in view of Ala-Luukko in view of Joss and

further in view of Berg. To the extent that these rejections remain applicable to the claims, as amended, the Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections as follows.

Applicants assert that Anvekar, Ala-Luukko, Joss, Berg, Molne, and Niepel, either individually or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest a communication system including at least the combination of a mobile device of a first public mobile network, the mobile device including a Subscriber Identity Module (SIM), the SIM having a single International Mobile Subscriber Identity in the first public mobile network (IMSI-H), wherein the first public mobile network has a Home Location Register (HLR) including a single HLR entry corresponding to the IMSI-H, a first Mobile Subscriber Integrated Service Digital Network (MSISDN) number for use in the first public mobile network, a second MSISDN number for use in a second public mobile network, and at least one signal gateway routing a first communication between the mobile device and the first public mobile network using the first MSISDN, and routing a second communication between the mobile device and the second public mobile network using the second MSISDN, wherein the at least one signal gateway routes the first and second communications using the single IMSI-H, and wherein the first public mobile network and the second public mobile network have a roaming agreement, as recited in amended claim 1.

Ala-Luukko, in paragraph [0023], discloses that one IMSI may include several telephone numbers. Ala-Luukko, however, fails to disclose the IMSI including multiple MSISDN, each of which are for use in different public networks that have a roaming agreement with each other. Thus, Ala-Luukko fails to disclose at least the combination of features recited in amended claim 1.

Molne, in col. 8, lines 14-32, discloses a SIM card 40 that can store four MSISDNs/MINs. Molne, however, fails to disclose at least the combination of features recited in amended claim 1.

Anvekar, Joss, Berg, and Niepel, in combination with Ala-Luukko and/or Molne, as cited by the Examiner, also fail to disclose at least the combination of features recited in amended claim 1, and therefore, fail to make up for the deficiencies of Ala-Luukko and Molne.

For at least the above reasons, the Applicant submits that claim 1 is allowable over the cited references. As claim 1 is allowable, the Applicant submits that claims 2-16 and 80, which depend from allowable claim 1, are likewise allowable over the cited references.

For similar reasons to those discussed with regard to claim 1, the Applicant submits that claims 17-19, 30, 39-40, 49, 61, 64, 68-69, and 77 are allowable over the cited references. As claims 17-19, 30, 39-40, 49, 61, 64, 68-69, and 77 are allowable over the cited references, the Applicant submits that claims 20-29, 31-38, 41-48, 50-60, 65-67, 73-76, 78-79, and 80-84, which depend from allowable claims 17-19, 30, 39-40, 49, 61, 64, 68-69, and 77, respectively, are likewise allowable.

III. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-61, 64-69, and 73-84 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

In the event this paper is not considered to be timely filed, the Applicant hereby petitions for an appropriate extension of time. Any fees for such an extension, together with any additional fees that may be due with respect to this paper, may be charged to counsel's Deposit Account No. 01-2300, referencing Attorney Dkt. No. 028327-00068.

Respectfully submitted,


Bogdan A. Zinchenko
Registration Number 57,473

Customer Number 004372
ARENT FOX LLP
1050 Connecticut Avenue, NW, Suite 400
Washington, DC 20036-5339
Telephone: 202-857-6000
Fax: 202-638-4810

BAZ/hs